

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,208	10/29/2001	Hiroyuki Odaka	2530 USIP	4444

23115 7590 09/09/2002

TAKEDA PHARMACEUTICALS NORTH AMERICA, INC  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
475 HALF DAY ROAD  
SUITE 500  
LINCOLNSHIRE, IL 60069

EXAMINER

COOK, REBECCA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1614	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/036,208	ODAKA ET AL.
	Examiner Rebecca Cook	Art Unit 1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7,11 and 22-27 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-7,11 and 22-27 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. 
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

✓ The abstract is objected to as not describing the instant invention.

Claims 1-7, 11, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. No support is seen on page 32 for the recited method for lowering the concentration of glycosylated hemoglobin.

Claim 2 is rejected on the ground of Judicially Created Doctrine as being drawn to a compound with no common core. In re Harnisch, 206 UPQ 300. While the recited compound has a common utility, it has a variable core and the members of the compound as represented by the terms R, Y, E, L, M, X and Q are so disparate chemically as not to be members of a recognized chemical class of compounds, but represent a plurality of heterocyclic classes.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 2 is the intent that when L and m are combined with each other that CH and C form a double bond?

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 11, 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 749 751 (page 1), Kheir El-Din et al (abstract, page 363) and DRUG U AN 1999-29667 (abstract) in view of WPIDS 1990-361604 (abstract).

EP 0 749 751 discloses that insulin sensitizers, including the one of claims 1-4, 11 are used to treat diabetes.

Kheir El-Din et al discloses that anorectics, including the one of claims 5-7, are used in combination with a hypoglycemic compound. DRUG U AN 1999-29667 discloses that sibutramine improves glycemic control in diabetics.

The instant claims differ over the references in reciting a method for lowering the concentration of glycosylated hemoglobin and specific anorectics.

However, WPIDS AN 1990-361604 discloses that glycosylated hemoglobin is a marker for glycemic control and used to monitor control of blood glucose. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that using an insulin sensitizer in combination with an anorectic would lower glycosylated hemoglobin, since the art discloses that they each improve glycemic control in diabetics and this would be seen when glycemic control in a diabetic is monitored by measuring glycosylated hemoglobin.

Furthermore, no unobviousness is seen in using a different anorectic, since Kheir El-Din et al and DRUG U AN 1999-29667 each disclose that different anorectics are useful in treating diabetics.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225

USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-7, 11, 22-27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,329,402. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because WPIDS AN 1990-361604 discloses that glycosylated hemoglobin is a marker for glycemic control and used to monitor control of blood glucose. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that using an insulin sensitizer in combination with an anorectic would lower glycosylated hemoglobin, since the art discloses that they each improve glycemic control in diabetics and this would be seen when glycemic control in a diabetic is monitored by measuring glycosylated hemoglobin.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: the insulin sensitizers of claims 2-3 and the anorectics of claims 5-7, 22-24.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of both insulin sensitizer and anorectic for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The following references were not considered as they were not in the parent file:  
EP 0 440 333, JP 09 067 271, JP 05 143 196.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Cook whose telephone number is (703) 308-4724. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 5:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel, can be reached on (703) 308-4725. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

*Rebecca Cook*  
REBECCA COOK  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP-1614

September 4, 2002